

REMARKS

A Final Office Action was mailed on May 3, 2005. Claims 1 – 39 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 39 have been amended to further clarify the nature of the present invention and to address informalities.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,802,042 (Rangan) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,258 (Ram). Applicants amend claims 1-39 to further clarify the nature of their invention and to address informalities, and respectfully traverse this rejection.

Rangan discloses an Internet portal system for gathering data from Internet sites and preparing a report for a user in response to a request by the same user (see, e.g., column 3, line 30 – column 4, line 28 of Rangan). Toward this end, the user is able to prepare a portal page personalized for the same user based on his/her request (see, e.g., Figure 2 of Rangan).

More specifically, according to Rangan a user gains access to various applications via an Internet portal server 31, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2. These applications may include banking information (my bank.com), stocks information (my stocks.com), shopping information (my shopping .com), mortgage information (my mortgage.com), airline tickets information (airline.com), etc. It will be appreciated that the information in those applications is searched, updated, managed and prepared for the same user who gains access through the portal. Rangan fails to teach or suggest that the access to such sensitive and confidential information may be allowed to another – different – user.

If for the sake of argument, this Rangan's user is analogized to Applicants' guest as suggested in the Final Office Action, page 12, paragraph 45 ("subscriber is a guest to portal"),

then it is not clear how Rangan can teach or suggest the following claimed feature of the present invention, as recited for example in claim 1: "receiving a profile of said Internet subscriber with respect to at least a first of said guest web pages, said profile including at least information defining levels of access for each of the one or more guests". Since there is only one user according to Rangan disclosure, this feature cannot be found in the patent.

Similarly, other features referring to the profile of the Internet subscriber or the Internet subscriber himself, as recited for example in Applicants' claim 1, cannot be found in Rangan for the same reason as state above. One and only one user gains access to web pages with applications according to the patent, and Rangan cannot possibly contemplate allowing access to other, different users to view this user's banking information, stocks, shopping, etc.

In contrast to Rangan, Applicants' claimed invention is directed to providing one or more Internet web pages that are accessible to and personalized for a guest of the Internet subscriber. That is, the subscriber and his or her guest are two different users of the Internet. To further clarify and emphasize this feature of the present invention, independent claims 1, 14 and 26 have been amended to recite "said guest being a different user of the Internet than the Internet subscriber."

According to the Final Office Action, Ram is relied upon only for the proposition of disclosing information defining levels of access for each of the one or more guests. Even if, for the sake of argument, this proposition is correct, Ram still fails to cure the deficiencies in Rangan as described above. Namely, Ram does not supplement Rangan with the disclosure of an Internet subscriber and his profile to result in Applicants' claim 1.

Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments with respect to amended independent claims 14 and 26 to submit that amended independent claims 14 and 26 are not rendered obvious


by Rangan and Ram, whether taken alone or in combination. As dependent claims 2 – 13, 15 – 25 and 27 – 37 each depend from one of allowable independent claims 1, 14 and 26, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2 – 13, 15 – 25 and 27 – 37 are also allowable for at least this reason. Applicants' representative respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-39. Favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Passage of this application to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

We respectfully request that all fees relating to this application be charged to Deposit Acct. No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987
Docket No.: 100583-00083 (VOCL 17.031)
BSM:fd